

1  
2  
3  
4 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
5 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA  
6

7 PAUL WILLIAM DRIGGERS )

8 Petitioner,  
9 vs. )

10 LOUIS WINN, WARDEN,  
11 Respondent. )  
12

No. CV 09-0183-TUC-DCB (BPV)

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

13  
14 Petitioner, Paul William Driggers, who is confined in the Federal Correctional  
15 Institution-Tucson, filed a Petition for A Writ of Habeas Corpus by a Person in Federal  
16 Custody Under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (“Petition”) on March 31, 2009. (Doc. No. 1.)  
17 Petitioner raised four grounds for relief in the Petition.

18 Petitioner raises four grounds for relief in the Petition:

- 19 (1) Petitioner is punished and wrongfully deprived of good time credits, in  
20 violation of his due process rights, because he has a disability which  
21 prevents him from providing a urine sample within a 2-hour time limit;  
22 (2) Petitioner was wrongfully deprived of good time credits and privileges;  
23 (3) Petitioner is wrongfully punished because he cannot provide a urine  
24 sample or “pay a debt” to BOP; and  
25 (4) Petitioner has been wrongfully designated as a “prior use” inmate, in  
26 violation of his constitutional rights.

27 Petitioner seeks restoration of his good time credits, to have his name taken off the  
28 “Prior Use” list, and to be randomly selected for drug testing like other inmates. The

1 District Court issued its initial screening order, dismissing Ground Three as repetitive,  
2 and calling for an answer from Respondents on Grounds One, Two, and Four of the  
3 Petition. (Doc. No. 3.)

4 On July 15, 2007, Respondents filed an answer explaining that, on June 9, 2009,  
5 Warden Winn took Petitioner off the suspect list for drug testing. (Doc. No. 9.)  
6 Additionally, on June 22, 2009, Discipline Hearing Officer Petricka conducted a re-  
7 hearing of Petitioner's incident report from FCI, Florence, Colorado for Refusing to  
8 Provide a Urine Sample and found that, based on Petitioner's Generalized Anxiety  
9 Disorder, it appears his refusal to provide a urine sample was not intentional. Based on  
10 this evidence, DHO Petricka expunged the incident report and restored the 41 days of  
11 Good Conduct Time which had previously been forfeited as a result of that incident  
12 report. (Answer, at 2-3.) Finally, a plan is in place to accommodate Petitioner's  
13 anxiety disorder in the event he is randomly selected to provide a urine sample,  
14 allowing Petitioner extra time in a dry cell if needed..

15 Respondent concludes that these corrective steps appear to address all three of  
16 Petitioner's requests for relief contained in his Petition. Respondents therefore request  
17 that the Court dismiss the petition as moot.

18 Petitioner agrees with Respondent's request that this case be dismissed, and  
19 agrees that he has been granted the relief requested. A case becomes moot when "it no  
20 longer present[s] a case or controversy under Article III, § 2, of the Constitution."  
21 *Spencer v. Kemna*, 523 U.S. 1, 7 (1998). Although Petitioner suggests that the Court  
22 consider retaining ancillary jurisdiction until the expiration of Petitioner's term of  
23 incarceration, in the event Petitioner is transferred to another facility, or new  
24 supervisors or hires are unfamiliar with Petitioner's issue. A court must have  
25 jurisdiction over a case or controversy before it may assert jurisdiction over ancillary  
26 claims. *See Peacock v. Thomas*, 516 U.S. 349, 355 (1996)(citations omitted). Because  
27  
28

1 the Magistrate Judge recommends that this case be dismissed as moot, the Court would  
2 have no jurisdiction to assert over any ancillary claim.

3 Accordingly,

4 This Court recommends that the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Doc. No.  
5 1) be DISMISSED.

6 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636(b), any party may serve and file written objections  
7 within ten days after being served with a copy of this Report and Recommendation. A  
8 party may respond to another party's objections within ten days after being served with  
9 a copy thereof. Fed.R.Civ.P. 72(b). If objections are filed the parties should use the  
10 following case number: **CIV 09-0183-TUC-DCB**.

11 DATED this 31<sup>st</sup> day of August, 2009.

12  
13  
14   
15 Bernardo P. Velasco  
United States Magistrate Judge  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28